



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/534,509	03/24/2000	Zenoviy Tkachuk	000152	2421

23850 7590 12/03/2002

ARMSTRONG, WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP
1725 K STREET, NW.
SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

CHEN, SHIN LIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1632

DATE MAILED: 12/03/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/534,509

Applicant(s)
Zenoviy Tkachuk

Examiner
Shin-Lin Chen

Art Unit
1632



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Shin-Lin Chen (3) _____
(2) Nicolas Seckel (4) _____

Date of Interview Nov 25, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 20, and 55

Identification of prior art discussed:

Kilkarni et al., 1998

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed possible 35 U.S.C. 112 first enablement rejection of amended claim 1 and its dependent claims and 103(a) rejection of added claim 55. Applicants argue there is unexpected result by using purified yeast RNA as disclosed in the present application as compared to the yeast RNA used by Kulikarni. Applicants may further amend claim 1 and provide supplemental amendment and arguments for those rejection. Examiner faxed Iyer et al., 1996 to Mr. Seckel as requested on telephone.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/534,509

Applicant(s)
Zenoviy Tkachuk

Examiner
Shin-Lin Chen

Art Unit
1632



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Shin-Lin Chen (3) _____
(2) Nicolas Seckel (4) _____

Date of Interview Nov 21, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed:

Kulkarni et al., 1998.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:


Discussed 103(a) rejection, and new 112 first paragraph enablement issue of the amended claim. Applicant may submit supplemental amendment to address those issue.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required